

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending. Applicants thank the Examiner for continuing to allow claims 13-24, and for indicating that claims 9-12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the subject matter of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-8 stand rejected.

Applicants amend claim 1 to recite that the pressure-relief valve is configured to open and release fluid *in response to* excess pressure exerted on the expandable balloon. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, for example, at page 4, line 34 to page 5, line 5. No new matter is added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments set forth above and the remarks below.

Rejection Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8 are rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,800,493 of Stevens et al. (Stevens). The Office Action asserts that Stevens discloses a an anchoring balloon device having a flexible elongate member (3) with an interior lumen extending therethrough for the delivery of an inflation fluid, an expandable balloon (5) disposed about a portion of the elongate member and in fluid communication with the lumen via at least one port, and a pressure-relief valve (18) for regulating the pressure of fluid within the expandable balloon.

Amended claim 1 recites a pressure-relief valve that is configured to open and release fluid *in response to* excess pressure exerted on the expandable balloon. Stevens does not teach or even suggest such a valve. As set forth at Col. 5, lines 34-40 and lines 50-56, and Col. 6, lines 1-10, the pressure within the system disclosed by Stevens is monitored by displays located on a control unit panel, and is controlled by *manually* pressing and depressing the fluid fill valve (18) to inflate and deflate the pressure within the expandable bladder. Accordingly, the valve does not release fluid in response to the application of pressure to the expandable

balloon. Claim 1 is therefore not anticipated by Stevens, and thus represents allowable subject matter. Claims 2-8 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim.


Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks above, Applicants submit that claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance.

In the event that the above amendments and remarks are not deemed to place this case in condition for allowance, an opportunity to interview with Examiner Chang is requested. Applicants encourage the Examiner to telephone the undersigned upon receipt of this response to discuss any issues that may remain.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 3, 2003



Lisa J. Michaud
Reg. No. 44,238
Attorney for Applicant(s)

NUTTER, MCCLENNEN & FISH, LLP
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02110-2699
Tel: (617)439-2550
Fax: (617)310-9550

1223817.1